

November 19, 1999

**Who Earns Your Paycheck? Who Spends It? Who Decides?**

**Republicans Against Democrats**

"I always like to go to Washington," Bob Hope said, "it gives me a chance to visit my money." Mr. Hope must have been working a Democratic crowd. They find that sort of gag funny.

Republicans are fighting to leave money in the pockets and pocketbooks of the workers who earned it, and Republicans are fighting to leave decision making with State and local officials who are entitled to it. Democrats, on the other hand, want to increase the flow of money and power to Washington, D.C. Democrats like to filter both money and decisions through Washington's bureaucrats. Consider the following differences between the parties:

**TAXES**

**Republicans**

The Republican-controlled Congress passed a bill that would have allowed the American people to keep \$792 billion of their own money over the next decade (which is but a tiny fraction of the money that taxpayers will be sending to Washington over the next 10 years). The bill also provided long-overdue tax reform by, for example, eliminating the marriage penalty.

**Democrats**

The President vetoed the tax bill. The President wants the money to continue flowing to Washington. Millions of taxpayers find the President's position inexplicable. The Tax Foundation recently reported that taxes now cost every American \$10,298 per year. Americans pay more in taxes than they do for food (\$2,693), clothing (\$1,404), and shelter (\$5,833) *combined!*

**HEALTH CARE**

**Republicans**

Republicans have fought to increase access to health insurance and to keep costs down. The bill passed by Senate Republicans protected patients and made health care coverage more affordable by (1) allowing all Americans to choose their doctors, (2) making Medical Savings Accounts available to all Americans, (3) letting the self-employed fully deduct their health insurance, and (4) making long-term care insurance more affordable.

**Democrats**

Democrats, on the other hand, tried to take medical decisions away from families and give them to lawyers and bureaucrats. Democrats seem to think sick people are most in need of lawyers, not doctors and nurses. Also, Democratic proposals are so costly as to drive millions of Americans out of health care plans.

## EDUCATION

### Republicans

Republicans are trying to ensure that education money is controlled by parents and local communities. For example, (1) Republicans provided local educators with flexibility to use federal funds for teacher training so that schools would be getting not just adults to stand at the blackboard, but trained and competent teachers; (2) with Ed-Flex and other reforms, Republicans are bringing an end to the days when Beltway bureaucrats told school districts how to educate kids; and (3) in a remarkable new reform, the Republican Congress has set aside millions of dollars in Title I funds so that poor kids in dysfunctional schools can get vouchers to transfer to a public school or charter school of the family's choice.

### Democrats

Congressional Democrats seek to use the Federal Treasury to control education decisions that ought to be made by local school boards. It took five votes before Republicans could break the Democratic filibuster on the Ed-Flex bill, and after the filibuster was broken Republicans had to fight off Democratic amendments that would have gutted local flexibility. For his part, President Clinton mocks parents and school boards. "It's not their money," he said last week. "If they don't want the money, they don't have to take it. If they're offended by it, they can give it to other States and other school districts."

## LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

### Republicans

Republicans have fought to keep local communities — those who depend on the land for their livelihoods — involved in managing federal lands and forests. With respect to the Clinton-Gore Administration proposals shown in the right-hand column, Republicans (1) have been successful in allowing renewal of grazing permits unless environmental conditions have substantially changed since the permits were last approved; (2) have successfully protected existing mines from the Bureau of Land Management's new interpretation of law, thereby ensuring the continuance of thousands of high-paying jobs and millions of dollars worth of mineral production; and (3) are fighting (with some Democratic support) the move to "lock up" 43 million acres of public land.

### Democrats

The Democrats have tried to impose an imperial management process on federal lands. Recent examples include restrictions on grazing permits, a brand-new interpretation of mining laws, and shutting down 43 million acres of national forest to all mechanized activity — even mountain biking. These examples and many others come out of the federal bureaucracy because there is so little support for them among elected officials. (When considering the power of the federal bureaucracy, it is useful to remember that the Federal Government owns one out of every four acres in the country.)

Staff contacts: RPC Staff, 224-2946